

From: [Miller, Garyg](#)
To: [Turner, Philip](#)
Subject: RE: spoke to Jennifer
Date: Friday, January 10, 2014 4:58:00 PM

So, check this – if the fish tissue is 0.88 ppt TEQDF (or twice 0.44 below), then would the sediment level be 220 ppt TEQDF (twice 110 below)? That's our sediment PRG now, right? If so, I think that a fish tissue of 0.88 is below background for the river (I have to check that) & also well below the about 2.something ppt TEQDF fish tissue that TDSHS uses for a benchmark to issue fish consumption advisories.

Gary Miller
EPA Remedial Project Manager
214-665-8318
miller.garyg@epa.gov

From: Turner, Philip
Sent: Friday, January 10, 2014 4:33 PM
To: Miller, Garyg
Subject: spoke to Jennifer

Hi Gary,

I spoke with Jennifer, and gave her the heads up about bolstering the defense of the 0.5 RBA. We are assuming that their response will come as an attachment to the response to comments for the FS. Since the PCLs in the FS are what raised this issue with HQ, I'm thinking the RBA comments from us will be with our comments on the FS. IF we would like them to provide a separate memo bolstering the RBA, then we need to let them know.

BTW, the sediment PCL to protect the Subsistence Fisher was calculated to be 110. This is for dioxins and furans. There are others for PCBs, Arsenic and Mercury.

The fish tissue PCL (DFs) to protect the subsistence fisher was 0.44

The clam tissue PCL (DFs) to protect the subsistence fisher was 6.7

Phil



9493978